

REMARKS

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being
5 anticipated by Ker 3 et al. (US 6,144,542).

Claims 1-5,7,9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
as being unpatentable over Ker 1 et al. (US 5,576,557)
in view of Smith (US 6,049,119).

Claims 6,8,10,12,14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.
10 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ker 1 et al. in view
of Ker 2 et al (US 5,959,820).

Claims 19-24,33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
as being unpatentable over Ker 2 et al. in view of Smith.

Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
15 as being unpatentable over Ker 2 et al. in view of Smith
and further in view of Russ et al. (US 6,618,233).

Claims 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
as being unpatentable over Ker 2 et al. in view of Smith
and Russ et al. and further in view of Court Decision
20 In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184.

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Ker 3 et al. (US 6,144,542).

Claims 35-43,45-47,49,50,51 are rejected under 35
U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ker 3 et al.
25 in view of Smith.

Claims 38,48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
as being unpatentable over Ker 3 et al. in view of Smith
and further in view of Russ et al.

30 **1. Response to the rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C.
102(a):**

Claim 34 is currently amended, and reconsideration

of claim 34 is politely requested.

2. Response to the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

- 5 (1) In Ker 1 et al., the devices 100 and 200 are entirely two low voltage trigger silicon controlled rectifiers (LVTSCRs), and **not merely the elements Q1, Q2 or Q3, Q4 can be separately called a silicon controlled rectifier** (col. 4, lines 17-33). The circuit should be considered as a whole, and **cannot be arbitrarily separated**. According to the statement of the MPEP Sec. 2141.01, "**the reference must be considered as a whole**", the reference Ker 1 et al. is dissimilar to the present invention.
- 10
- 15 (2) The structure of two complementary SCRs 100 and 200 in Ker 1 et al. Fig. 1 is similar to the device 33 as **prior art described in the application**, and is totally different from the design of **independent ESD-detection circuit** of the present invention.
- 20
- 25 (3) Since the reference Ker 1 et al. is completely dissimilar to the present invention, Ker 1 et al. cannot be further combined with Smith or Ker 2 et al. to reject the application. Reconsideration of amended claims 1-18 is therefore politely requested.

3. Response to the rejection of claims 19-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 19-33 are canceled.

4. Response to the rejection of claims 34-55 under 35
U.S.C. 103(a):

(1) Claims 35, 40-43 are canceled.

5 (2) The connection between the ESD-detection circuit
and Vdd, Vss is not disclosed in the reference Ker
3 et al, and is currently added into claims 34 and
44 of the application for distinction. The
amendment is fully supported by the specification
and drawings, so reconsideration of amended
10 claims 34-55 is therefore politely requested.


15

Sincerely yours,

20



Date:



Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No.41,526

P.O. BOX 506

Merrifield, VA 22116

U.S.A.

25

e-mail: winstonhsu@naipo.com.tw